

Name: Jeffrey Roux  
E-mail Address: [Jeff@roux.org](mailto:Jeff@roux.org)  
Telephone: 5044310399

The plan has some good points within the scope of implementation with the exception of dealing with the wetlands. The Parish does not have an approved management plan by state and federal authorities – as one has not been developed/presented for approval. The Parish therefore does not have the authority to put into effect the dramatic changes presented in the document such as changing wetlands to general commercial or mixed commercial use. The Planning and Zoning Commission which is charged with this coordination is not staffed nor has the expertise to deal with the complex regulations in dealing with the wetlands.

One of the comments states that we were to capitalize on coastal management expertise. It was not evident in this serious fault with the document.

Minor point but none the less significant is that Ellington Subdivision is quite a ways from the wetlands interface of Willowridge and Magnolia Ridge which is mentioned in the document. Familiarity with the terrain is also questionable as to the location of historical sites and other sites.

This document and its conclusions although in draft form needs to be reviewed prior to any request for public input.

The document states that the commercial area needs to be increased by 400+ acres yet the expansion is much more and land that is not used now is in a much more advantageous position for growth because it is on higher ground but in some cases lacks the infrastructure. Turning several hundred acres south of the UP and BSNF tracks toward Hwy 90 is on a hiding to nowhere. State and Federal agencies have asked for environmental easements on this land in the Corps environmental document for the Western Tie In Levee. The Corps kicked the can to someone else because it is not their responsibility. If the Parish submitted a management plan to change this from wetlands to general commercial, we will be tied up in negotiations for years.

The hydraulic study for the western tie in is based on wetlands in the area and any changes that produces rooftops and cement will dramatically impact the planning as their plan does not have any pump station for the area. All these cost along with mitigation and legal costs will have to borne by the developer. The Planning and Zoning Commission does not have the where-with-all/budget/staff/expertise to take this on. Quite frankly nor does the Parish Administration. The public also will not support public funds to pay for mitigation.

The same applies for lands along Hwy 3127 and Airline drive in New Sarpy and establishing a mitigation bank in the Sunset drainage district.

Wetlands are a complicated issue as seen in permitting the levee on the westbank. Nothing has been done quickly (over 18 years and we are not there yet). Even with permitting the money is questionable.

The Willowdale extension to River Road is questionable because of recent briefs where the land will be donated if the use is suitable to the developer . The document addresses commercial development yet a recent brief appeared to state residential. The crossing of the tracks is questionable and the Regional Planning Commission was going to revisit the proposal. A similar problem exists in the development of land west of ADM in Ama. The RR tracks/ the Diversion/ with the Western Tie in Levee are major problems not discussed in detail as to infrastructure.

There are some good points in the document but over shadowed by the above.

There may be other issues presented by others as my basic familiarity is on the westbank and specifically from I310 to the Jefferson Parish Line.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit a comment in I feel a short period for public comment and with more time I would give page and paragraph comments.

**From:** Jara and Jeff Roux [<mailto:jeffnjara@roux.org>]  
**To:** 'VJ St. Pierre'

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 31, 2011 4:02 PM  
**Subject:** RE: land use plan

Not what is shown on map for wetlands area. The other corridor along Hwy 90 may be but it shouldn't be. With commercial growth in that area, the probability of damage to the environment is much greater if the area is inundated. All the agencies have been pushing the Corps to put environmental easements on this property. It is all defined in the documents for the western tie in levee. The Corps kicked the can to local govt (St Charles Parish)

From the zoning in the area a year ago, we did not do our part. And I've been asking P&Z about other permitting in the area near the old dump and again I think we have failed to follow the rules.

If I 49 is elevated there will be very few outlets to service the area. This is a very complicated issue and also will cost tons of money to mitigate the land. Jefferson will get the businesses once the bridge is finished and they won't fill out until way after 2030. There will not a need for more commercial and if there is we have the Bunge area in Ama that is higher without the mitigation costs and land at Dufrense/etc/Hahnville/Kilona.

The small land use study just completed for Ama did not cover I believe the land south of the tracks but it is all wetlands.

The same goes for the dev of the lands around the grain elevator and the diversion. You can't get there from here with the tracks and the diversion.

The study needs more time for review because it is embarrassing as presented. I'm happy to get with you but I have to read the entire doc in hard copy and other things have been in the way over the last week.

Jeff

**From:** VJ St. Pierre [<mailto:vj@stcharlesgov.net>]  
**To:** Jara and Jeff Roux

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 31, 2011 3:43 PM  
**Subject:** RE: land use plan

Jeff, it is my understanding these areas to be commercial are only 200' to 500' of the HWY

**From:** Jara and Jeff Roux [<mailto:jeffnjara@roux.org>]  
**To:** VJ St. Pierre  
**Cc:** Terry Authement; Kimberly Marousek; Leon Vial; Manina Dubroca; Matt Scallan

**Sent:** Tuesday, May 31, 2011 3:02 PM  
**Subject:** land use plan

Will the response date be extended??? Reading it on the computer which was hard because the map is essential, I question the statement about using the parish's expertise in coastal management.

When I look on the map and see hundreds of acres of wetlands north of Hwy 90 behind Ama being turned into general commercial and the hwy 90 corridor east of willowdale being put in to a mixed commercial corridor. The area presently is over 90% wetlands.

There is not a contiguous levee with a pump to drain this area and I definitely don't think the state and fed agencies will look the other way in granting permits.

This is only a short read into the doc.

I was going to look at the 1 at the library in Paradis but they don't have a copy. All the libraries should have multiple copies of these types of doc. For I 49 the Jeff library had multiple copies and I checked 1 out.

Name: Marcel Di Giovanni  
E-mail Address: [marceldig@mindspring.com](mailto:marceldig@mindspring.com)  
Telephone: 504-462-4575

Your Comments on the St. Charles 2030 Comprehensive Plan: Don't know if this went through, so I am resending:

There is a block of land, made up of several tracts, west and adjacent to LA 50, fronting on LA 48 and zoned C-2. My family owns two of the tracts. Other than the tracts fronting LA 50, the remainder of the 20+ acres has less than 500' frontage on a hard surface roadway (LA 48). The C-2 zoning seems inappropriate with so little roadway access. This land seems to fit the Open Land definition significantly better than the current zoning and I wonder why this has not been considered in the land use plan.

I am also confused about the perceived need for high density residential housing when the people would like to preserve the rural feel of St. Charles Parish. Thanks.

Name: Joan Robbins  
E-mail Address: [joan\\_robbins@att.net](mailto:joan_robbins@att.net)  
Telephone: 504.858.6029  
Your Comments on the St. Charles 2030 Comprehensive Plan:

I was very excited to see that in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, provisions were made in LU2 for farmland. Yet when I looked at all the maps, I could not find a single map that displayed the present farmlands being used as productive farmland. The farmland classification seemed to be thrown out and in its place were identified industry or business parks.

If the vision is to "preserve productive farmland and promote economically viable and compatible agricultural uses in the parish," then shouldn't there at least be maps that identify the present working farms of the parish - there are so few left. . . Taft, Montz, New Sarpy, Luling, St. Rose, Ama, Bayou Gauche.

As I see fuel prices increase at the fuel pumps and the blandness of fresh produce increase in our local grocery stores, I would think that preserving farmland would be one of the highest priorities. There is truly a farm-to-table movement in this country that we all should be a part of. I understand that farmlands do not produce the local revenue that industry does, but planning a community should not be around the increase of industry. It is a well known fact that the increase of industry decreases the residents in the industrial area. Afterall, no one wants to live that close to the industry where they work. They know too well the dangers their industry possesses. Don't just give lip service to farming.

**Marny Stein**

---

**From:** Jara and Jeff Roux [jeffnjara@roux.org]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 02, 2011 12:32 PM  
**To:** Marny Stein  
**Subject:** 2030 plan - Jara's comments

I am concerned about several aspects of the 2030 plan as outlined below.

Limited Time for Review:

The **limited time to review** (10 days) for a document of this complexity (and yes, I did participate in multiple meetings), as well as the fact that although the parish was supposed to have copies at every library, there was indeed none at the Paradis library. I don't know about the others.

Designated Authority for Coordination & Implementation of Plan:

The task for coordinating and implementing the plan has been assigned (as per the document) to the Planning & Zoning Commission – which seems to be a real stretch when you read the parish statement as to the mission of the commission. In addition, I do not believe that a commission with no staff and no budget for this should be tasked with this. In fact, it appears that they are to rely on the P & Z dept, which makes me wonder **why, if that is the case, it is not delegated to the dept. from the start, esp. when you look at the matrix and see who will be tasked with each function – almost always P & Z dept.**

In fact, I believe the outlined structure for coordination and implementation contributes to a **blurring of the lines of distinction between the commission and the dept**, which seems to be happening a great deal over the last several years.

Wetlands/commercial:

In addition, the plan lists large areas of wetlands (as currently designated) and converts them to commercial in the plan. I have not yet been able to study how the parish intends to get from wetlands to commercial and who is to bear the cost if mitigation is the route of choice, although it appears from cursory study that there is no “map” to get from wetlands to commercial. **Therefore, why put this “wish,” which seems to have very little relation to reality, into the plan without a really big asterisk! I wish the moon was made of chocolate ice cream, but I wouldn't put it in a document unless I was writing fiction for children.**

Unfortunately, due to the limited time the final draft was available for comment, I was not able to review more detail.

While it appears there are many excellent ideas, it would have been appreciated if a longer review period had been available.

Thanks,

Jara D.Roux  
10391 River Road